

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700120

A. List of Restoration Activities

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Ridgecrest Field Office proposes to continue restoration of designated closed trails in the Northern Jawbone-Butterbrecht Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Rand Mountains Management Area (RMMA). We would also like to start planning restoration efforts in the Red Mountain Sub-region (SR) and support a fencing crew to assist in barricading excessive trespass areas into Wilderness. All project areas are upland Mojave Desert scrub ecosystems; predominately Creosote and Blackbrush scrub habitat and Joshua Tree woodlands. Over 400,000 OHV recreation visitor use days are recorded in the project areas each year.

Proposed activities include: restoration and camouflaging of recently closed OHV trails in the limited use area; erosion control of decompacted areas and sites with significant rilling and gullification; Informational signing and outreach; Photo documentation and data collection to assess the efficacy of arid lands restoration in OHV recreation areas; and supporting archeological and biological inventories prior to site restoration. Site restoration will consist of a variety of techniques designed to accelerate natural revegetation and improve viable habitat. Active restoration will take place along the initial line-of-sight of the closed trail and discourage future incursions into the restoration area. An estimated 20,000 to 30,000 meters squared is to be restored. In areas where trespass has been an ongoing problem, some hard barricades, such as boulders and/or fences may need to be built. The scope of restoration in this grant includes sites that border wilderness and the Desert Tortoise Natural Area, and are within Desert Wildlife Management Areas (DWMA) and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), providing large-scale protected habitat for a number of sensitive and listed species. The area surrounding the open areas within the ACEC are limited-use areas and overlay habitat for numerous Federal and State listed species, sensitive species, and species of concern. Among these are the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*), Mohave ground squirrel (*Spermophilus mohavensis*), LeConte's Thrasher (*Toxostoma lecontei*), and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*).

B. How the Proposed Project Relates to OHV Recreation

Maps of the CA Desert District, Desert Access Guides (DAGs), and the Ridgecrest Resource Area were printed, distributed, and placed on the public webpage to identify the designated route system. While maps are a useful reference, it is unrealistic to demand all riders memorize the legal routes. Even if most riders carry DAGs while recreating in the limited-use areas, BLM should not expect them to stop frequently and refer to the map in order to conform to the land use plans. This restoration project will better define the designated route system on the ground and help OHV users comply with current laws.

Temporary closures and fencing have been used in the past in the Rand Mountains to prevent further habitat degradation, but this is not a goal of the BLM Ridgecrest Field Office. While fencing and temporary closures may prevent OHV-related habitat degradation, the BLM's mission is multiple-use. In order to prevent future closures, whether based on management or court decision, BLM is actively working to manage its designated route network to accommodate both natural resources and recreation. These restoration projects will allow BLM to continue providing excellent recreation opportunities while preserving sensitive resources and critical habitat.

C. Size of Project Site

The northern section of Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC is approximately 100,000 acres (of which approx. 25,000 acres are privately held). The Rand Mountains Management Area comprises 65,000 acres of public land. The Red Mountain Sub-Region encompasses 120,199 acres with 82% of that managed by the BLM.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Successful restoration of closed trails on a site-by-site basis, project area, and an entire sub-region, will be evaluated to assess the "health" of a restored site and the overall OHV user compliance on sites in the project area. Intensity of user compliance/non-compliance will be monitored for evidence of new vehicle tracks occurring after site restoration. Photo-monitoring will be used to evaluate the visual eradication of linear features (i.e., closed trails). Vegetation monitoring will be conducted on a sample of sites in each of the project areas to assess accelerated revegetation and establishment of native

plant species. Randomly-chosen, previously restored closed trails will be monitored for effectiveness and vegetation cover. Each site is given a unique identifier comprised of the polygon, designated route, and incursion number. Monitoring data for each site include: Date of restoration, area restored, restoration techniques employed on the site, type of incursion (e.g. hillclimb, parallel, crosstrail, etc.), OHV activity prior to restoration, past vandalism, and other past management. This data will be used to compare success rates among the restored sites based on proximity to OHV open areas, recreational value of closed trails (i.e., motivation for illegal trespass), restoration techniques, and supplemental management, such as additional law enforcement, barricading, signing, and fencing.

Restoration projects will be preliminarily evaluated as successful, if no less than 60% of the restored sites experience OHV trespass and native vegetation recruitment is greater on the restored site than the unrestored portion of the closed trail. Measuring the success of a closed and restored trail or trail segment will be determined through follow-up site visitation on a short-term and long-term basis to see if visual eradication of linear features has remained and no "fresh OHV tracks" are present. Where user non-compliance is high and restoration of closed trails is not occurring, alternative means of effectively closing the trail will be used. This may include, but is not limited to, using alternative methods to disguise closed trails, placing barriers at the entrances of closed trails and washes, signing, increased law enforcement presence, and combinations thereof.

E. List of Reports

Red Mountain Restoration Environmental Assessment

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

The natural resource specialist notifies Law Enforcement (LE) of restoration locations and requests increased patrols as necessary. Restoration crews call LE immediately if they encounter illegal OHV activity in the field. Restoration work crews would also monitor rider compliance with restoration and notify LE of areas with high non-compliance. The restoration projects complement law enforcement and facilitate the issuing of citations for "knowing and willful violations" of the following federal regulations: CFR 8341.1(c): "The operation of off-road vehicles is prohibited on those areas and trails closed to off-road vehicle use."; CFR 8341.1(f)(4): "In a manner causing, or likely to cause significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, improvements, cultural, or vegetative resources or other authorized uses of the public lands;"; CFR 8365.1-5(a)(1): "No person shall; Willfully deface, disturb, remove, or destroy...any scientific...resource, natural object or area;"; CFR 8365.1-5(a)(2): "No person shall; Willfully deface, remove, or destroy plants or their parts, soil, rocks or minerals..."

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700120

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Rand Mountains Vicinity Map](#)

[Rand Mountains Management Area Map](#)

[Jawbone Vicinity Map](#)

[Jawbone ACEC Map](#)

[Red Mountain Sub-Region Map](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Jawbone ACEC Trespass](#)

[Jawbone ACEC trespass eventually into Wilderness](#)

[Rand Mountain Management Area Trespass out of camping area](#)

[Rand Mountain Management Area Trespass](#)

[Red Mountain Subregion Trespass](#)

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Restoration

6/2/2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Ridgecrest Field Office proposes to continue restoration of designated closed trails in the Northern Jawbone-Butterbrecht Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Rand Mountains Management Area (RMMA). We would also like to start planning restoration efforts in the Red Mountain Sub-region (SR) and support a fencing crew to assist in barricading excessive trespass areas into Wilderness. All project areas are upland Mojave Desert scrub ecosystems; predominately Creosote and Blackbrush scrub habitat and Joshua Tree woodlands. Over 400,000 OHV recreation visitor use days are recorded in the project areas each year.</p> <p>Proposed activities include: restoration and camouflaging of recently closed OHV trails in the limited use area; erosion control of decompacted areas and sites with significant rilling and gullification; Informational signing and outreach; Photo documentation and data collection to assess the efficacy of arid lands restoration in OHV recreation areas; and supporting archeological and biological inventories prior to site restoration. Site restoration will consist of a variety of techniques designed to accelerate natural revegetation and improve viable habitat. Active restoration will take place along the initial line-of-sight of the closed trail and discourage future incursions into the restoration area. An estimated 20,000 to 30,000 meters squared is to be restored. In areas where trespass has been an ongoing problem, some hard barricades, such as boulders and/or fences may need to be built. The scope of restoration in this grant includes sites that border wilderness and the Desert Tortoise Natural Area, and are within Desert Wildlife Management Areas (DWMA) and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), providing large-scale protected habitat for a number of sensitive and listed species. The area surrounding the open areas within the ACEC are limited-use areas and overlay habitat for numerous Federal and State listed species, sensitive species, and species of concern. Among these are the desert tortoise (<i>Gopherus agassizii</i>), Mohave ground squirrel (<i>Spermophilus mohavensis</i>), LeConte's Thrasher (<i>Toxostoma lecontei</i>), and burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>).</p>		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Other-Natural Resource Specialist	2088.000	30.000	HRS	62,640.00	0.00	62,640.00
	Archeologist	174.000	40.000	HRS	0.00	6,960.00	6,960.00
	Park Ranger	80.000	20.000	HRS	0.00	1,600.00	1,600.00
	Other-Wildlife Biologist	80.000	39.000	HRS	3,120.00	0.00	3,120.00
	Recreation Planner	174.000	30.000	HRS	0.00	5,220.00	5,220.00
	Other-Recreation Branch Chief	174.000	45.000	HRS	0.00	7,830.00	7,830.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Restoration

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-Field Office Manager	80.000	65.000	HRS	0.00	5,200.00	5,200.00
	Other-Administrative Technician	80.000	25.000	HRS	0.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
	Other-Heavy Equipment Operator	80.000	28.000	HRS	2,240.00	0.00	2,240.00
	Other-Law Enforcement	200.000	38.000	HRS	7,600.00	0.00	7,600.00
	Total for Staff				75,600.00	28,810.00	104,410.00
2	Contracts						
	Heavy Equipment Operator	80.000	200.000	HRS	16,000.00	0.00	16,000.00
	Other-Restoration crew in Jawbone ACEC Notes : One 7 person crew to work in the Jawbone/Butterbredt ACEC	8.000	32000.000	MOS	256,000.00	0.00	256,000.00
	Other-Restoration crew in RMMA & others Notes : One 7 person crew to float between the Rand Mountains Management Area and other areas as needed.	8.000	32000.000	MOS	256,000.00	0.00	256,000.00
	Other-Volunteer Hours	16704.00 0	18.000	HRS	0.00	300,672.00	300,672.00
	Other-Fencing Crew	2.000	30000.000	MOS	60,000.00	0.00	60,000.00
	Other-Chicago Botanical Garden Intern	20000.00 0	1.000	EA	0.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
	Other-Field Survey Archeologist	2088.000	40.000	HRS	83,520.00	0.00	83,520.00
	Total for Contracts				671,520.00	320,672.00	992,192.00
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Other-Barricades/Fencing	5.000	5000.000	MI	25,000.00	0.00	25,000.00
	Signs	500.000	30.000	EA	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00
	Other-Hand Tools	1.000	500.000	MISC	500.00	0.00	500.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Restoration

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Total for Materials / Supplies				40,500.00	0.00	40,500.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
	Equipment Rental	80.000	100.000	HRS	8,000.00	0.00	8,000.00
	4x4 Vehicle	12.000	500.000	MOS	6,000.00	0.00	6,000.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				14,000.00	0.00	14,000.00
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
	Other-Printing of Rec. Opportunity Guide	20000.00 0	0.750	EA	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00
	Other-Travel and Training	1.000	2500.000	MISC	2,500.00	0.00	2,500.00
	Total for Others				17,500.00	0.00	17,500.00
7	Administrative Costs						
	Administrative Costs-10 Percent	1.000	81882.000	YR	0.00	81,882.00	81,882.00
	Total Program Expenses				819,120.00	431,364.00	1,250,484.00
	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES				819,120.00	431,364.00	1,250,484.00
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES				819,120.00	431,364.00	1,250,484.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Restoration

6/2/2009

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	75,600.00	28,810.00	104,410.00	
2	Contracts	671,520.00	320,672.00	992,192.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	40,500.00	0.00	40,500.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	14,000.00	0.00	14,000.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	17,500.00	0.00	17,500.00	
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	81,882.00	81,882.00	
Total Program Expenses		819,120.00	431,364.00	1,250,484.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		819,120.00	431,364.00	1,250,484.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		819,120.00	431,364.00	1,250,484.00	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700120

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- c. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 3 – 9

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

There are no wetlands or navigable waters. The desert tortoise (Federal-threatened) inhabits the restoration areas. Restoration has a positive impact on desert tortoise habitat by reducing fragmentation. Monitoring for signs of desert tortoise is done prior to restoration. Protocols in the project environmental assessment specifically state that if signs of active or live tortoises are found, restoration of the site will not continue. Alternative management decisions will be made in consultation with the BLM wildlife biologist.

Work required in advance of restoration projects includes preparation of categorical exclusions or environmental assessment of individual restoration projects planned for BLM lands in the California deserts. The California State Ecologist will serve as coordinator to ensure that all restoration projects proceed according to NEPA processes, including approval from BLM archaeologists and wildlife biologists responsible for attesting that restoration projects conserve or enhance cultural and biotic resources and that the NEPA documents address conditions and concerns of all BLM resource specialists. In addition, the BLM State Ecologist will work with the OHMVR Division's CEQA specialist to ensure that all of the State of California concerns for CEQA and the California Endangered Species Act are met or exceeded.

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

The intended impacts are to benefit both desert ecosystems and public expectations: to restore wildlife habitats, their many native species (especially the desert tortoise), and desert ecosystem to desired condition and function; and to provide sustainable OHV-recreation opportunities and access for people in the California Deserts. Ongoing coordinated land management that emphasizes law enforcement patrols, OHV trail monitoring, accurate and clear signing for designated routes, and public outreach will cumulatively support initial restoration efforts for achieving the environmental conditions stipulated in the recently implemented sub-regional amendments to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan.

Trails were designated closed based on criteria of the "Route Designation Decision Tree" process through the WEMO amendment to the CDCA Plan. Criteria included existing alternative routes, recreational value, impacts to and conservation of sensitive species, and mitigation of cumulative habitat impacts. Miles of designated open routes are available in the project areas and existing open areas are in close proximity to the project areas, eliminating negative cumulative effects of the trail closures as a result of user conflicts or building new areas.

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

Sites with a slope exceeding 30 percent that are mechanically ripped will have rock or straw bale water bars, check dams, or geotextile netting installed to prevent accelerated erosion.

BLM will ensure that the sites with steep slopes or highly erodible soils are restored in a manner that does not result in degradation of the land. Removing routes should contribute to soil stabilization. Sand and dust storms originating from the areas are likely to diminish over time when closed and illegal routes are restored with native vegetation cover. A natural appearance will develop through seed germination and seeding.

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

There are no highways designated as state scenic highways within the view sheds of the proposed project area. Therefore, the implementation of these management plans shall have no affect on scenic resources associated with a designated state scenic highway.

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

Ample OHV recreational opportunities exist within the Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC, Rand Mountains, and Red Mountain Subregion including over 500 miles of designated open routes throughout the limited use area and these areas are adjacent to over 70,000 acres of OHV open areas. The mountainous terrain existing in these areas provides unique OHV opportunities that are not found in other desert OHV recreation areas. With limited substitutes for these recreational opportunities, it is not likely that this project will lead user groups to recreate elsewhere. The project will increase use on designated open and maintained routes throughout these areas, dispersing OHV recreation over a larger area and containing it to manageable routes. As a result, OHV use will not significantly increase in the vicinity of the project site. There is a chance for minor impacts off-site. Monitoring has shown that a small percentage of restored sites incur new "parallel" sections to the restored area as illegal riders trespass off-route and destroy natural resources. Sites that develop new parallel incursions will be signed closed and site locations will be given to law enforcement for reference and future enforcement planning.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[Jawbone/Butterbrecht ACEC Restoration EA](#)
[Rand Mountains Management Area Restoration EA](#)
[Ridgecrest Resource Area wide Surface Restoration EA](#)
[DNA- OHV Grant Application & Management of OHV Recreation](#)
[Red Mountain Restoration EA](#)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700120

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 27

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Domestic water supply (4 points)
☒ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [6]
☒ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species [6]
☒ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [3]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

There are many federal and state listed species, such as the Desert Tortoise, Mohave Ground Squirrel, Tehachapi Slender Salamander, and Red Rock Poppy, whose habitat is being denuded due to unlawful OHV ridings. Revegetation of this denuded habitat leads to the stabilization of soils through root formation and dissipated rain splash. In addition, water dispersal structures are implemented, which decrease soil erosion and lead to better water quality in washes and riparian zones. There is a small community in Kelso Valley who could be adversely impacted from soil runoff into their shallow ground water supply, if it is not adequately protected. Cultural resources, such as the Red Mountain National Register Historic District, are protected when restoration sites prevent unauthorized access. Without the restoration, sensitive areas such as the Rand Mountain Management Area, Jawbone Butterbreth ACEC and various wildernesses would not be protected from OHV damage.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
☐ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
☐ Management decision (1 point)
☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

West Mojave Plan Amendment, 2005

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☒ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Native plant material is used to disguise illegal routes and foster re-vegetation of native species. On sites that are difficult to restore or where restoration is not sufficient, barriers and other control devices will be used to discourage OHV trespass. Intensity of user compliance will be monitored for evidence of new vehicle tracks and re-vegetation occurring after site restoration. This data will be used to compare success rates among the restored sites based on proximity to OHV open areas, motivation for illegal trespass, restoration techniques, and supplemental management, such as barricading, etc. The Best Management Practices in this area have been well developed and continue to improve. The designated open routes in the restoration project area are well-signed and maintained and educational signs are employed to identify desert restoration projects, etc. All restoration sites are adjacent to designated open routes which provide recreation opportunities in the restored area.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan of 1980, with Plan Amendments 1982-1999
California Desert Protection Act (1994)
Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC Restoration Plan (1982)
Rand Mountains/Fremont Valley Plan (1993)
West Mojave Plan (2006)

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ☒ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The Ridgecrest Field Office staff have made presentations and participated in discussions at three different meetings to solicit public input into the development of this grant proposal. These public meetings have included: Ridgecrest Steering Committee, on February 26, 2009.

Friends of Jawbone, on February 18 and January 21, 2009.

Sierra Club's California and Nevada Wilderness and Desert Committees, on February 7 and 8, 2009.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Friends of Jawbone

Desert Survivors

California Wilderness Coalition

Sierra Club

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project was the spider web of illegal routes across limited use and closed areas. This basic problem has been effectively addressed through proper route designation. The Ridgecrest Field Office is slowly, but methodically resolving the problem with route signing and illegal route restoration.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
- ☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- ☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)